

1964

## Iron Imports Continue To Feed the Fire of Unemployment

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, pig iron and cast iron soil pipe imports continue to feed the fire of unemployment and ever-decreasing workloads in one of our basic American industries. Many of our plants in iron and steel areas are now working far below capacity. It just does not make sense for us to allow pig iron and cast iron soil pipe imports to come flooding in when so many of our hard-hit areas are suffering from lack of orders.

This situation in the first quarter of this year has become increasingly worse as compared with the first quarter of 1963. To support this contention and to further point out the factors contributing to this already deplorable situation, I submit herewith substantiating figures derived from U.S. Department of Commerce statistics:

Pig iron imports by customs district	1st quarter, 1964	1st quarter, 1963	Change, 1964 versus 1963
Atlantic coast.....	33,414	17,684	+88.9
Gulf coast.....	32,217	10,259	+214.0
West coast.....	2,718	7,032	-61.3
Canadian border and inland.....	16,200	11,464	+41.3
Offshore.....	346	248	+39.5
Total pig iron imports.....	84,896	46,439	+82.8

Mr. Speaker, the dollar value of pig iron imports for the first quarter of 1964 totaled \$3,352,618 versus \$1,942,561 for the same period in 1963, or an increase of 73 percent, or \$1,410,057. Pig iron exports for the same period totaled \$421,461 in 1964 versus \$1,191,510 for 1963, or a decrease of 65 percent, or \$770,049 in 1964. The total outflow of dollars for pig iron imports and the decrease in dollars for exports represent an increase in dollar loss to the United States of \$2,180,106 for the first quarter of 1964 over 1963.

Cast iron soil pipe imports, by customs district	1st quarter, 1964	1st quarter, 1963	Change, 1964 versus 1963
Atlantic coast.....	2,502	3,323	-24.7
Gulf coast.....	527	87	+505.7
West coast.....	6,910	4,225	+63.5
Offshore.....	120	320	-62.5
Total cast iron soil pipe imports.....	10,059	7,955	+26.4

Mr. Speaker, in 1964 the dollar value of the above pipe imports was \$1,114,978; in 1963, \$821,243, or an increase of 36 percent. As a matter of information, cast iron pressure pipe imports are no longer identified.

## New Wheat Program Adds Half Billion Dollars to Income of Producers

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, misunderstandings and some confusion have developed in the operation of the new voluntary certificate wheat program.

Some wheatgrowers are raising questions concerning the market price of wheat and the income of wheatgrowers under the program which is effective for the 1964 crop. Some of the questions and statements imply that the new program imposes a tax against wheat and that the market price is lower as a result. Other questions indicate the wheatgrowers are being given misleading information—or information far from the facts. Some growers are complaining that they did not know when they seeded their wheat last fall that those farmers planting within their production allotments would receive substantially higher income than those who did not comply with their allotments.

Mr. Speaker, the new voluntary wheat program takes not one cent away from any wheat producer, and adds substantially to the income of those farmers who are cooperating in this program to hold down surplus and wasteful output of this food grain.

The fact is that even farmers who are not cooperating in the voluntary program are profiting by its operation.

In the May 1963 referendum wheat farmers rejected the marketing quota certificate program offered to them. If two-thirds of the producers had approved this marketing quota approach, all producers would have complied with production adjustments to prevent market gluts and wasteful surpluses, and all producers would have received substantial price supports through Commodity Credit Corporation loans and through certificates adding to their income.

But this program was disapproved, and this left in force only the law already on the books which provided a price support for the 1964 crop of wheat at 50 percent of parity, or about \$1.25 or \$1.26 a bushel, with the only growers receiving such support being those who stayed within their farm wheat allotments.

The situation threatened disaster for the wheat country. Wheat producers confronted a reduction in their 1964 income of over a half a billion dollars, as compared with 1963, when the wheat crop was supported at 82.6 percent of parity.

Congress could not permit such a catastrophe to befall the wheat country. Not only the income of wheat farmers would be slashed, but the well-being of hundreds of towns and cities in wheat States and the Nation's general economy were involved.

When wheat was being planted last

fall there was widespread discussion of the prospects for Congress enacting a new wheat law that would add to the income of producers cooperating in efforts to hold down production.

Immediately after the May 1963 referendum, bills were introduced in the Congress proposing new wheat programs. The first bill embracing a voluntary certificate program was introduced on July 29. As early as December 11, the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, headed by Hon. GRAHAM PURCELL, held public hearings to survey the thinking among wheat producers, and the public generally, on a new program.

Farmers were aware of the possibilities of new legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the prevention of a disastrous drop in wheat prices and in the purchasing power of wheatgrowers was the basic reason for enactment of the new wheat legislation that became law last April 11. This is what the new wheat program is doing for farmers:

First. The farmer who exceeds his wheat allotment and even the one who is growing wheat from fence to fence is not subject to marketing quota penalties. He can sell his wheat without any interference whatever and whenever he wants to, just as he would have done had Congress not enacted the new voluntary program. In fact, because so many others growers are producing within their allotments and the loan rate has been increased 4 cents a bushel, his market should be about 4 cents a bushel higher than it would have been without the new program.

Second. The average loan level for wheat produced in 1964 was increased from \$1.26 a bushel to \$1.30. These price support loans are available to farmers who are within their allotments.

Third. Farmers participating in the voluntary program will receive, in addition, certificates valued at 70 cents a bushel on 45 percent of the normal production of the farm allotment, and certificates valued at 25 cents a bushel on another 45 percent of their normal production. Thus, when the value of the certificates is added to the price-support loan the wheat for domestic food will return the participating producers on the average \$2 a bushel, and the wheat going into export will return to the producers \$1.55 a bushel.

Fourth. Moreover, farmers who actually have taken acreage out of wheat production are receiving diversion payments, based upon normal yields.

In summary, this is the present situation:

Noncomplying farmers: There has been only one change, which is an improvement in their market by a 4 cents a bushel increase in the price-support loans to compliers and by a reduction in the overall wheat supply by those who are participating in the program.

Cooperating farmers: Those who are complying with the production adjustment features of the voluntary program are receiving in 1964 around half a billion dollars more in income than would have been the case had not Congress

A3614

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 1

enacted the voluntary wheat certificate program.

Mr. Speaker, of course, in a new program so vast, there will be some errors in administration. I am confident that the county ASCS committees and the program administrators in Washington will promptly correct such errors as they are brought to their attention.

The main thing to remember, in appraising this new program, is that it placed no penalty whatever against the marketing of wheat by those farmers who are not complying with the program, and it increases substantially the income of those farmers who have cooperated by not exceeding their farm allotments.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that farmers will not be misled by some people who already are trying to destroy this program, as they destroyed the old wheat program which worked for so long and so well in the past. The new program was enacted entirely for the purpose of improving the income of wheat producers, which in turn will maintain business stability in hundreds of towns and cities in the wheat country, and in the economy generally.

Mr. Speaker, I, today, issued a press statement pertinent to these remarks. This press release follows:

**COOLEY EMPHASIZES FARMER PROFITS IN NEW WHEAT PROGRAM**

Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY of the House Committee on Agriculture said today the new voluntary wheat program "takes not one cent away from any wheat producer, and adds substantially to the income of those farmers who are cooperating in this program to hold down surplus and wasteful output of this food grain."

Mr. COOLEY made the statement in response to numerous inquiries about the operation of the voluntary certificate program effective for the 1964 wheat crop.

"Some wheat growers are raising questions concerning the market price of wheat and the income of wheat growers under the new wheat program," he said. "Some of the questions and statements imply that the new wheat program imposes a tax against wheat and that the market price is lower as a result. Other questions indicate the wheat growers are being given misleading information—or information far from the facts."

The fact is, he pointed out, even farmers who are not cooperating in the voluntary program are profiting by its operation.

"With the disapproval of marketing quotas in the May 1963 referendum," Mr. COOLEY said, "the law required that the price support for the 1964 crop of wheat be reduced to 50 percent of parity, or an indicated support of \$1.25 or \$1.26 a bushel, and the only growers receiving such support would be those who stayed within their farm wheat allotments."

"The prevention of a disastrous drop in wheat prices and in the purchasing power of wheat growers was the basic reason for the new wheat legislation that became law last April 11. This is what the new wheat program is doing for farmers:

"1. The farmer who exceeds his wheat allotment and even the one who is 'growing wheat from fence to fence' is not subject to marketing quota penalties. He can sell his wheat without any interference whenever and whenever he wants to, just as he would have done had Congress not enacted the new voluntary wheat program. In fact, because so many other growers are producing within their allotments and the loan rate has been increased 4 cents a bushel,

his market should be about 4 cents a bushel higher than it would have been without the new program.

"2. The average loan level for wheat produced in 1964 was increased from \$1.26 a bushel to \$1.30. These price-support loans are available to farmers who are within their allotments.

"3. Farmers participating in the voluntary program will receive, in addition, certificates valued at 70 cents a bushel on 45 percent of the normal production of the farm allotment, and certificates valued at 25 cents a bushel on another 45 percent of their normal production. Thus, when the value of the certificate is added to the price-support loan the wheat for domestic food will return the participating producers on the average \$2 a bushel, and the wheat going into export will return the producers \$1.55 a bushel.

"4. Moreover, farmers who actually have taken acreage out of wheat production are receiving diversion payments, based upon normal yields.

"In summary, this is the situation:

"Noncomplying farmers: There has been only one change, which is an improvement in their market by a 4 cents a bushel increase in the price-support loans to compliers and by a reduction in the overall wheat supply by those who are participating in the program.

"Cooperating farmers: Those who are complying with the production adjustment features of the voluntary program are receiving in 1964 around half a billion dollars more in income than would have been the case had not Congress enacted the voluntary wheat certificate program."

Mr. COOLEY said that farmer rejection of the marketing quota certificate program in the 1963 referendum threatened disaster for the wheat country, with wheat producers confronting a reduction of their 1964 income by over a half a billion dollars as compared with 1963.

"Congress could not let such a catastrophe befall the wheat country," he said, and he pointed out that immediately after the May referendum last year bills were introduced in the Congress proposing new wheat programs. He emphasized that when the 1964 wheat crop was planted last fall farmers were aware of the possibilities of new legislation.

"Of course, in a new program so vast," he said, "there will be some errors in administration. He voiced confidence that the county ASCS committees and the program administrators in Washington would promptly correct such errors as they are brought to their attention.

"I hope that farmers will not be misled," he said, "by some people who now are trying to destroy this program, as they destroyed the old wheat program which worked for so long and so well in the past. The new program was enacted entirely for the purpose of improving the income of wheat producers, which in turn will maintain business stability in hundreds of towns and cities in the wheat country, and in the economy generally."

**Burundi Independence Day**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

**HON. ADAM C. POWELL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, Burundi today celebrates the second anniversary of her independence. We take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to

His Majesty King Wmambutsa IV; and to His Excellency the Burundi Ambassador to the United States, Leon Ndenzako.

Burundi is a small kingdom situated in the mountains and plateaus which separate the Nile and Congo River Basins. Its many rivers, two of which are the southernmost sources of the Nile, rise in these mountains to begin their long twisting journey to the sea. The capital, Usumbura, which is a bustling city of 50,000 inhabitants, overlooks Lake Tanganyika, the longest fresh-water lake in the world. Most of the trade between this landlocked country and the outside world travels down this body of water to be taken either to Atlantic or Indian Ocean ports.

Three different ethnic groups in Burundi live harmoniously together. A small number of pygmies remain, while the overwhelming number are Hutus, who from 85 percent of the population. These industrious people have traditionally been farmers, an occupation that most in Burundi still follow. Since the fifteenth century, their overlords have been the Tutsi, a nomadic, pastoral people of Hamitic origins who migrated to this area from Ethiopia.

European influence came late to this land which is nestled far from the oceans. Visits by the great explorers, Speke, Stanley and Livingstone, were soon followed by those of Germans and in the 1880's Germany was given control of Burundi. This rule lasted until World War I when Belgian troops occupied the country for the Allies. Under their rule, health measures, schools and new crops were introduced, as well as other improvements.

With Belgian preparations for independence, Burundi has enjoyed a stable government since its independence. The Mwami, or leader of the Tutsi, heads the government, while a national assembly is elected by direct universal suffrage from among the competing political parties.

On this second anniversary of Burundi independence, we send our best wishes to the Burundi people and their government and look forward to watching them solve the many problems that have and will face them as they grow within the world community.

**To Amend the Immigration Laws**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD my statement before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the House Committee on the Judiciary, in support of H.R. 10990. I have introduced this bill, and may I add that other Members have introduced similar bills, for the purpose of effecting a much-needed revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act.



1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3615

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN, DEMOCRAT, OF CONNECTICUT, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 10990

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appear today in support of H.R. 10990, the bill which I have introduced to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The demands and pressures which existed when the basic law was enacted some 40 years ago have become radically different. The countries which provided the bulk of our immigrants in times past now barely use the quotas available to them, while the needs of other countries far exceed their allotted number. The subsequent McCarran-Walter Act was at best a patch-up job which has since proven woefully inadequate.

The bill for which I now speak is similar to that which President Kennedy sponsored a year ago. Its passage has likewise been formally urged by President Johnson. The purpose of the bill is to liberalize the existing national origins quota system which has worked such hardship upon members of the families of American citizens who have been compelled to remain abroad. It has been the peoples of Mediterranean and southern European origin, particularly from Greece, Italy, and Portugal, who have suffered most under the existing law. A law which permits large numbers of families to remain broken can only work misery on both sides of the ocean. As Mr. CELLER has already pointed out, the criterion for admissibility to this country must no longer be "What is your race or origin," but rather "Who are you and what can you do for the country in which you have chosen to live?"

H.R. 10990 provides for gradual elimination of the quota system over a 5-year period. During this period it further provides for the allocation of unused quota numbers to oversubscribed countries. While the minimum number admissible from each country is raised to 200, the total quota figure for each country is to be reduced by 20 percent each year. These places by which the national totals are reduced are placed in a "pool," from which admissions are to be allocated on a first-come, first-served basis in order of the established preferences.

The issuance of visas is rendered considerably more flexible. Each year foreign citizens seek to visit this country on business or pleasure. Likewise increasing numbers of students from abroad want to attend our universities. The inordinate difficulty which they now encounter in obtaining visas tends only to deter qualified foreigners from visiting the United States. Whereas under the existing law the quotas provide for order of preference only within each individual country, my bill will now determine the priority between nationals of different countries throughout the world. In addition to this, the broad discretion to be vested in the President and in the Immigration Board allows the free allocation of previously unused quotas to applicants from any nation, so that the basic provision of a 10-percent maximum monthly allocation of visas does not prevent the subsequent issuance of visas which were not used up during a previous month. The bill further eliminates the waste of quota numbers by those who apply for visas and then never apply for admission, thereby depriving others of the right. To the same end, quotas may not be used up by people of nonquota status.

The nonquota status itself is to be extended to several important groups, including parents of U.S. citizens and all natives of independent Western Hemisphere countries. Likewise, at the discretion of the Attorney General, certain mentally afflicted members of the immediate family of a U.S. citizen, barred from admission under the

existing laws, may be admitted as nonquota immigrants.

There are several significant changes in the preference system. Further latitude is allowed for immigrants with special skills, or with the ability to perform a job for the filling of which a shortage exists in the United States. Also, in addition to the three existing categories, a new fourth preference is created in favor of the parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence. The process of applying for a preference is simplified as well. Replacing the existing and often harsh requirement that an applicant for a "special skills" preference submit an affidavit from a U.S. employer is a provision that allows the Attorney General to grant the preference upon affidavit from the immigrant, plus any further documentary evidence which the Attorney General, having consulted the Secretary of Labor, may require.

To administer our immigration policy, this bill provides for the establishment of a seven-member Immigration Board, three members of which would be appointed by the President, two by the President of the Senate, and two by the Speaker of the House. The function of this Board would be to study the conditions here and abroad which bear on our immigration policy. The members would consult with the Secretaries of Labor, State, and Defense and would then in turn make recommendations to the President and the Attorney General as to the allocation of quotas and admissions such as will best serve the purposes of this act.

A more flexible, up-to-date immigration law has long been a necessity. Our Chief Executive has urged this reform. Our citizens demand it, as evidenced by each day's mail, which brings new pleas from those suffering from the inequity of the existing laws. I believe we have a moral obligation to answer their call.

### Alexandria's Landmark Closes

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial in the Alexandria Gazette for Monday, June 29, carries a message that should be of deep concern to the Members of this 88th Congress. It is perhaps significant that the Alexandria Gazette, established in 1784, is America's oldest newspaper.

It is far more important to us in Congress, too many of whom have reached a conclusion before knowing the problem, to realize that this story of one independently owned store failure could have been repeated 1,200 times for 1,200 more closing on that same day.

In this election year we are all of us hearing of more benefits, protections, opportunities, and insurances to the individual than ever before. To hear the stories without doubt is to believe that poverty will be obliterated, small business will be protected, old folks will live better, medicines will be for all and America will be heaven on earth.

During this Congress, many of its Members—including myself—have been fighting for passage of a bill to give some

small measure of protection to the independent merchant. The pressures against it have been strong. They have been constructed on slogans and false conclusions.

Those slogans have created an answer even before the question is understood. They have completely, it would seem, buried the real problem facing this Nation today—that problem is the certain fact that almost 400,000 small businesses will have failed this year. Many of them have failed and thousands more will close before the 89th Congress convenes because they have had no protection from us. Is this fulfillment of our duty? I think not.

The quality stabilization bill is important because it is the only measure in Congress offering any protection, any hope, to these dying small businesses. Yet it was "shelved" by the Senate Committee on Commerce without any discussion on its merits.

Mr. Speaker, the Alexandria Gazette in this editorial gives the story of but one store. There are 1,200 such stories for the same day. There will be 1,200 more today, and tomorrow. I ask you all, as I insert this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are we not being derelict and damned in our sworn duties to the people we represent?

The editorial follows:

#### THE CORNER DRUGSTORE PASSES

On Tuesday night one of Alexandria's ancient landmarks closes its doors forever, a casualty of what we have come to accept as progress. The drugstore of W. F. Creighton at the northwest corner of King and Royal Streets, which never bowed to the soda and lunch counter or a line of toys or garden and lawn furniture but has limped along nonetheless, bows to the inevitable. Its ancient mahogany fittings, darkened with the patina of time, may go under the auctioneer's hammer and wind up in a museum, a marvel of man's handiwork before the advent of stainless steel and brilliant plastic. The apothecary jars of many colors will go the same route or become decorative conversation pieces in a parlor.

The passing of Creighton's will touch a nostalgic note in the hearts of many oldsters as well as remove a neighborhood convenience. It is one in a procession that seems to mark the demise of the small, neighborly shopkeeper, powerless in the face of the competition of the mighty chains. In days when the drugstores close at dusk and send the suddenly ill to a distant all-night establishment, accessible only by automobile, we might recall the role played by the corner apothecary shop in our history.

The oldtime druggist seemed to be a breed in himself. He had to be a registered pharmacist, capable of deciphering the scribbled notes of the doctor, making sure the dosage was not lethal. He prided himself on his service to the community. Either he or a clerk-pharmacist lived on the premises or one slept in the store. This was essential in the days before the telephone. One never knew when the local general practitioner might be called in the dark of night and give a prescription that had to be filled in greatest haste.

Never was the store closed without a sign in the door telling where the proprietor could be found in emergency. The shop often was a community gathering place. Civic associations were unnecessary. Views were given frequently and vehemently down at "doc's," a common name for the man behind the prescription counter. When one was ill but not

A3616

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 1

seriously enough for consulting his physician, "doc" could turn to his shelves and select a remedy from his line of specifics. Very often it worked.

The passing of the corner drugstore is more than a symptom of the march of progress. It also marks the passing of an era of spontaneous neighborly relations and the departure of a friendly hand.

### How To Make Things Worse Than They Really Are

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOHN M. MURPHY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in today's New York Times, James Reston discusses the politics of Vietnam as it relates to the politics of the 1964 presidential election. He doesn't say so, but implied in the article is the fact that we no longer have a bipartisan foreign policy in this country. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include this article:

#### HOW TO MAKE THINGS WORSE THAN THEY REALLY ARE (By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 30.—The first major foreign policy issue of the election campaign is developing over Vietnam, and it illustrates the dangers of letting campaign rhetoric influence fundamental decisions on peace and war.

The Republicans are insisting quite rightly, that Vietnam is a proper subject for criticism and debate between the parties, but they are also insisting that the policy of the United States in that country must be to achieve total victory.

The Johnson administration is less adventuresome. Its stated aim there is "to prevent a Communist victory," but lately, under the pressure of events in Saigon and of politics here, it has been talking rather more boldly about "winning" the war there, and Secretary of State Rusk has even gone as far as to suggest that the defense of Vietnam is as vital to the security of the United States as the defense of Berlin and West Germany.

#### FRANCE'S AGONY

Before we confuse what is good politics with what is good policy or even good sense, maybe we should take a look at the history of that melancholy peninsula. The French were in control there for 70 years, except during the Japanese occupation during World War II.

They finally gave up and left just 10 years ago this coming month, at 0340 Geneva time, July 21, 1954, to be exact. They were not merely "advising" the anti-Communist Vietnamese against Ho Chi Minh's Communist Vietminh guerrillas. They had 400,000 of their best troops directly involved in the struggle and they were beaten, though even the French received considerable aid from the United States in the last years of the struggle.

Over a period of 8 years that war cost France 172,000 casualties. The Vietminh lost a quarter of a million. Economically, from 1945 to 1955, France lost 10 times the total value of its vast investments in that country, and as Bernard B. Fall reports in "Two Vietnams," "The French Army came out of the war a gaunt ghost of its former self, the

cream of its regular officers dead and crippled, the rest of them embittered."

It is true that conditions there are not the same. The United States is guiding a counterinsurgency war there primarily to gain time to create a counterrevolution, but this is a slow business, and this is precisely the issue the Republicans are raising.

It is not only Senator GOLDWATER who is calling for a strategy of total victory, but the House Republican policy committee issued a detailed report this week that puts the point in more specific terms.

"A victory in South Vietnam over the military and subversive threats of communism," it said, "is urgently required. We must repeal today's complacent commitment 'to prevent a Communist victory' and substitute a commitment to insure a victory for freedom."

But how is this to be done? Who is to repeal it? The committee does not tell us, but Representative GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan, the chairman of the House Republican conference and ranking Republican on the Defense Appropriations Committee, who issued the report, wants the United States itself to take over the conduct of the war.

Something very odd is happening here to the Republican Party, when responsible leaders of the GOP like Ford, who for years have been contrasting the Republicans as the "party of peace" with the Democrats as the "war party," are now calling for instant victory in a jungle war 8,000 miles from home, right up against the borders of China, which commands the allegiance of almost a quarter of the human race.

The Republican Party has managed to occupy the White House for only 8 out of the last 32 years and it got there then only because General Eisenhower was regarded rightly as a prudent, experienced and peaceful man.

Yet his successors in the party that is supposed to have unusual respect for history are now complaining, not that we are doing too much but that we are doing too little; not that we should limit our objectives and our risks but that, as the Ford committee says, we should "take the initiative in effecting a 'revolution of liberty' throughout the world."

#### KENNAN'S WARNING

When George Kennan, who is one of our most experienced and articulate students of foreign affairs, came at the end of his diplomatic career to sum up his views of America's diplomatic blunders of the past, he blamed in particular:

"The American tendency to view any war in which we might be involved not as a means of achieving limited objectives in the way of changes in a given status quo but as a struggle to the death between total virtue and total evil."

The United States has slowly, very slowly, come to ponder the wisdom of this observation in Vietnam, but in the emotion of the campaign this limited exercise will be savagely attacked and all we can hope is that the administration will not be pushed in the process into political promises it will not want to redeem in the future.

### Rwanda Independence Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. ADAM C. POWELL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, Rwanda today celebrates the second anniversary

of her independence. We take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of Rwanda, Gregoire Kayibanda; and to His Excellency the Ambassador of Rwanda to the United States, Pierre Canisius Cyicarano.

Rwanda, a country of mountains and plateaus, lies in the very heart of Africa on the divide between the great Congo and Nile River Basins. Most of its territory has a tropical, highland climate and is covered with savanna grassland. Agriculture remains the basis of the economy, although deforestation and erosion, scourges against which the Rwandans are making valiant efforts to amend, has long hampered production in this densely populated African country.

Because of its remote position, Rwanda was one of the last regions in Africa to be visited by the explorers of the 19th century. John Speke, on his tortuous journey which led to the discovery of Lake Victoria, was probably the first European to cross its terrain in 1858. He was followed over a decade later by Stanley and Livingstone on their famous trip together around Lake Tanganyika and its environs. Later German explorers, who were a prelude to control by their country, arrived. German rule passed to the Belgians after World War I. Under the Belgians, a 10-year program to improve all aspects of Rwanda's economy, social services, and education was launched in 1952.

Even before independence, the Rwandans exhibited their love of democracy and rule by the majority. By an overwhelming vote in 1961, the monarchy was replaced with a republican form of government. Rwanda also voted against independence with Burundi, the kingdom to the south, also under Belgian tutelage. Today Rwanda has a president and legislative assembly which was elected by direct universal suffrage. Officials of local government are also democratically elected.

Two years is a short time in the history of any nation, but already much has happened in Rwanda. On September 18, 1962, it became a member of the United Nations. Rwanda is also a member of some of that organization's specialized agencies.

Today Rwanda, which was once considered an exotic country in central Africa, is a recognized and accepted member of the family of nations. We salute Rwanda on its second anniversary of independence and wish it the best in its fight to realize social equality, economic advancement, and political stability.

### WSBXTV's "Salute to America" Parade Is Smash Hit According to Variety

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, every American takes pride in the founding of